DRAFT
Meeting Minutes
DEFT-NoName Coordination Team (DNCT)
October 13, 1998
9:30am to 12:00pm

Participants
Jim White, Pete Chadwick, Elise Holland, BJ Miller, Pete Rhoads, Dave Fullerton, George Barnes, Curtis Creel, Peter Louie, Arthur Hinojosa, Paul Fujitani, Larry Brown, Serge Birk, Joe Miyamoto, Jim Buell, Russ Brown, Tom Cannon, Ron Ott, Dave Briggs

Agenda:
i. Scenarios.

Action Items
1. None

Highlights
- Developed 6 scenarios for review by steering committee.

- Format for scenarios was developed by group. Then 4 scenarios were laid out.

1. Pete C Scenario 1
2. BJ Miller Scenario 2
3. Curtis Creel Scenario 3
4. Peter Louie Scenario 4

- Two additional scenarios were laid out by group based on earlier suggestions by Bruce and Mike T. Details of the six scenarios are provided in the scenario attachment.

General Discussion Items:
- George expressed concern about our inability to model scenarios as described.
- Peter R stated his concern that scenarios should be balanced and address urban water quality. How can we address water quality objectives with these scenarios in Stage 1?
- George felt there was nothing in scenario #1 or #6 for water supply.
- Pete C expressed concern that the scenarios were frameworks not a scenarios, and that we should homogenize into distinct frameworks.
- George agreed and stated they need more details.
- General consensus that many details are needed before these are true scenarios. As is it is hard to quantify differences in scenarios. No way to see differences play out.
- There are many commonalities in scenarios. We could model common items in one shot. Then do best we can to simulate effects of non-commonalities.

- BJ suggested that we need to make scenarios acceptable to both sides, and thus this would be a useful process.
- Pete C expressed importance of carrying forward scenarios that provide full AFRP water requirements.
- General consensus that we could go to management with these basic scenarios without details worked out. Can state rule that they will be balanced.

Scenario 1 Discussion:

- Dave F likes this, but is concerned about no sharing of new storage.
- Pete C suggests making storage bigger with sharing.
- Peter L stated that 600 TAF would be difficult to develop in Stage 1, plus it will be difficult to then share relaxation in winter after such a fall.
- George suggested not changing the fall standards, just leave them as they are and allow flexibility. These standards would be a great cost to water users. How would they make up such water?
- Jim W concerned there would be no chips to cash in for fall constraints under flex ops, thus the need for more stringent standards. He is not sure how much water would be needed to provide new standard.
- BJ suggested that standards could be phased in as new storage becomes availabl, and that our intent is to develop such fixed protections sometime in Stage 1.
- Dave F suggested that we shouldn't be afraid of a fixed new standard, because we can always change it in the future if it doesn't meet our objectives. There will be many deals to be made and things to test.

Scenario 2 Discussion:

- BJ stated that export floor rises with more than just export improvements. Fixing non-controlled mortality allows trade off for increased exports. Would be conservative to ensure a positive env effect. Phase concept in over time as we learn from its application. Cap is permanent, but floor comes up. Cap would vary by water year type - as a function of hydrology and storage available. Intent to allay water user fears.
- Jim W suggested that both caps and floors should vary with hydrology.
- Pete C stated that bringing in other sources of mortality is a different concept; more like 4 Pumps program, which is a concept accepted by env side.
- Dave F: Sharing of new supplies developed from outside of exports; will require developing exchange rates which is a lot of work.
- Jim W: many more tools on table.
- Pete C: env may claim that these things are already planned and should not get credit for doing. Also something like shutting down commercial fishery would not be allowed to mitigate for export losses.

Scenario 3 Discussion:

- Dave F related that this is similar to #1 but without the changed fall standards, but it is not reasonable to have to make up all AFRP actions before any benefits can be accrued.

- Pete R stated that we can firm up env water in this manner and not have to resort to more stringent standards.
- Pete C suggests that we need to define some specifics so that we can evaluate the scenario, otherwise the sharing is just a concept.
- Jim W suggests meeting new AFRP demands through new tools as they come on line and then begin to share subsequent developed tools.
- BJ stated that sharing would begin once all AFRP actions were covered, but we may not get permits for many of the tools envisioned.
- Pete C suggested that some entities may not accept these conditions.
- Peter L stated that AFRP actions require water that has yet to be developed, and we could spend all the benefits of our tools on these actions.

Scenario 4 Discussion:

- Dave F: fooling with outflows is a new ballgame with its own problems. Env may allow if they get some of potential benefits of changes in X2.
- BJ: We should consider changing X2 standards. Inviability of X2: difficult to talk about it in abstract. There are biological reasons to consider changes in X2 standard. Small changes can supply a lot of water - but have little or no effect on env.
- Pete C: as we learn more there may be reasons to change X2 standard, but it would be hard to implement such a change at beginning of Stage 1.

Scenario 5 Discussion:

- BJ: this is an alternative to fish triggers. Arises out of something like X2. We could guarantee water supply tied to these chips.
- Dave F: we would build up credits to use this tool. Need a sophisticated way to account to provide assurances to water supply.
- Pete R: elegance of simplicity.
- Jim W: X2 and Vamp standards would not be changed, only export standards.

Scenario 6 Discussion:

- George felt this was dead on arrival.
- Dave F felt this one does not earn its chips and we could tie new standards to new tools as they became available.
- BJ agreed that new standards could be goals contingent on increased water supply, which would be over a long period of new water supply development.
- Peter L felt this scenario would take a lot of study.
- BJ felt this scenario was an outlier to our thinking.
- Pete C stated that it would be difficult to turn this into a scenario because it does not decribe rules for relaxing or increasing exports - it would lead to exaggerated costs in model run.
- Consensus that we need to discuss this in more detail with Mike.